

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -NOVEMBER 1, 2005- -7:30 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the regular meeting at 7:46 p.m.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

(05-516) Councilmember deHaan stated that he thought the Public Hearing to accept new, revised preliminary designs for the Cineplex and a 352-space parking structure [paragraph no. 05-524] and the Public Hearing to consider an Appeal of the Planning Board's approval of Use Permits [paragraph no. 05-525] should be heard in reverse order.

PROCLAMATIONS, SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

(05-517) Proclamation honoring the developers of the Marketplace, and declaring November 1, 2005 as Donna Layburn, Paul Hossack, and Gerald Mackey Appreciation Day.

Mayor Johnson read and presented the proclamation to Donna Layburn and Gerald Mackey, developers of the Marketplace.

Donna Layburn thanked the Council for the proclamation and support.

Councilmember Matarrese thanked the developers for persevering.

Councilmember deHaan stated that he appreciates moving forward with the developer's vision.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that the Marketplace is a great place to shop; tenants have created a wonderful synergy; owners are friendly, outgoing, and helpful.

Valerie Ruma, Alameda, stated that she is a fan of the marketplace.

(05-518) Library project update.

The Project Manager gave a brief project update.

Mayor Johnson requested that the Project Manager alert the Council on available options if the project is still under budget.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether items removed through value engineering were prioritized, to which the Project Manager responded in the negative.

Councilmember deHaan requested that items removed through value engineering be prioritized by cost and gain.

Councilmember Matarrese stated direction was given to review longevity versus spending; analysis should be given to saving \$26,000 today and spending \$60,000 for restroom rehabilitation in the future because durable countertops were not installed.

The Project Manager stated there was significant discussion on the countertop issues; countertop prices would be provided to the Council.

Councilmember Matarrese requested a report on long-term projections for replacement costs.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember deHaan moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

[Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*05-519) Minutes of the Special and Regular City Council Meetings held on October 18, 2005. Approved.

(*05-520) Ratified bills in the amount of \$2,861,380.74.

(*05-521) Recommendation to accept the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending September 30, 2005. Accepted.

(*05-522) Recommendation to authorize the City Manager to pay Bay Ship & Yacht Company \$134,598.19 for facility upgrades to the Main Street Ferry Terminal. Accepted.

(*05-523) Resolution No. 13906, "Amending Resolution No. 9460 to Reflect Current Positions and Entities to be Included in the City of Alameda's Conflict of Interest Code and Rescinding Resolution No. 13726." Adopted.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

(05-524) Public Hearing to accept new, revised preliminary designs for the cineplex and a 352-space parking structure at the corner of Oak Street and Central Avenue, within the C-C T (Community Commercial Theater) Zoning District.

The Development Services Director gave a brief presentation on the project.

Mr. Towey with Komorous-Towey Architects gave a Power Point presentation.

Councilmember deHaan stated there are seven parking levels; inquired whether the elevator tower reached up to the seventh level.

The Architect responded in the negative; stated the previous and current designs are the same; the seventh level was extended to make up for some lost spaces.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the highest peak would be the elevator tower and whether the roof level was now 70 feet.

The Architect responded that the top of the elevator tower was the highest point.

Councilmember deHaan stated that the canopies look industrial; inquired whether other options were considered.

The Architect responded that the industrial nature of the canopies could be valid, depending on execution; the historical period being evaluated had very flat and thin awnings; many were roll out awnings; the intention is to keep the metal very flat and thin as opposed to having a sloping top; the corrugated metal would not be visible; the canopies could be executed to look finished.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there was another design which could pull back the 20 inch protrusion.

The Architect responded that the previous design studied what would occur if the protrusion had to be pulled back; twenty-five seats and a few feet off one of the screen's sides would be lost; his charge was to work with the approved floor plans.

Mayor Johnson opened the public portion of the hearing.

Proponents (In favor of the design): Pauline Kelley, Alameda; Pete Halberstadt, Alameda (read a list of 33 people in favor of the design); Chuck Millar, Alameda; Marilyn Schumacher, Alameda; Sherri

Stieg, Alameda; Harry Hartman, Alameda; Michael John Torrey, Alameda.

Opponents (Not in favor of the design): Anthony Mark, Oakland; Birgitt Evans, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS); Jack Boeger, Alameda; Christopher Buckley, AAPS; Richard Rutter, AAPS; Irene Dieter, Alameda (submitted comments); Valerie Ruma, Alameda; Victoria Ashley, Alameda; Vern Marsh, Alameda; Robert Gavrich, Alameda (submitted comments); Jay Levine, Alameda (submitted comments); Jon Spangler, Alameda; Ron Schaeffer, CMFA (submitted comments); Kevin Fredrick, Alameda; David Miller, Alameda; Dave Kerwin, Alameda.

There be no further speakers, Mayor Johnson closed the public portion of the hearing.

Councilmember Daysog stated that the project design was light years ahead of the previous design.

Councilmember Matarrese concurred with Councilmember Daysog; stated Council direction was followed to make the façade less modern, match the architectural character of the existing theater, and accommodate the project; the project should be accepted.

Councilmember deHaan stated that he is comfortable with the design; the design addresses some of the AAPS's concerns and project continuity; he appreciates that time was taken to review the design.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that she is particularly pleased with the parking garage; the staff and Architect did an excellent job of following Council direction; thanked AAPS for input; stated the parking garage is an excellent design.

Mayor Johnson stated that she appreciates the staff's and Architect's work; improvements are outstanding; the project should move forward.

Councilmember deHaan stated he is concerned with the 70-foot high parking structure, which would be even with the marquee; stated Mariner Square's new boat storage facility is 50-feet tall; Alameda Point Hangers 41 and 39 are 45-feet tall; massing is a concern.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he voted against the matter several months ago on very narrow grounds, which still stand; he is concerned that the City is not getting the best business deal out of the project; the rent on the historic theater amounts to 30 cents per square foot when the market rate is around \$1.50 to \$1.80

per square foot; charging 60 cents would amount to millions of dollars over time; the Council cannot treat fiscal issues lightly; there is pent up demand for a movie theater in Alameda; he is concerned with project redevelopment; a lot of public dollars are being put into the project; \$9 million is being put into the historic theater and more is being put into the parking garage and cineplex; public investment would be paid back through future tax increments; redevelopment needs to add value and not just recoup investments; projects need to generate sales tax, more property taxes, and more revenues; investments are being made that are not just redevelopment dollars, but dollars that previously went to other taxing public entities; the promise of redevelopment is not just to revitalize blighted areas but also to pay back entities; there would not be associated redevelopment costs if there was a better business deal; the project is more of a street and sidewalk public works project, where recouping of public funds is not expected; he is glad that the historic theater would be restored; he is concerned with getting the best possible rent for the City; a beautiful project should never trump bottom line considerations; he will stick to his guns regarding the fiscal aspects of the project.

Mayor Johnson stated that the Council voted on the business plan in May; Councilmember Daysog voted for the business plan, which included the square footage rental; the historic Alameda theater project is not intended to be strictly a business deal, but also a historic renovation project; a new cineplex could be built for less money; the historic theater is being significantly restored; she would hope that a second and third phase restoration could be done; saving the building first is necessary.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he voted for the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) in May; a DDA is never consummated until all the land use approvals are put in place per the Municipal Code; financial feasibility was referenced when the Downtown Vision Plan was adopted.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of the revised design of the cineplex and the parking structure.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Gilmore and Matarrese and Mayor Johnson - 3. Noes: Councilmember Daysog - 1. Abstentions: Councilmember deHaan - 1.

(05-525) Public Hearing to consider an Appeal of the Planning Board's approval of Use Permits for: a) multi-screen theatre, live theatre, and public assembly use in the C-C T district pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.22; b) fifty eight (58') foot building height

for the Cineplex pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.9A.g.2; and c) extended hours of operation until 3:00 a.m. for the theatre pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.9A.c.1(a) for up to 24 days per year. The site is located at 2305 -2317 Central Avenue, within the C-C T (Community Commercial Theatre Combining) District. Applicants: Kyle Conner, Alameda Entertainment Associates, LP. Appellants: Ani Dimusheva and Robert Gavrich; and

(05-525A) Resolution No. 13907, "Upholding the Planning Board's Approval of Use Permit UP05-0018 for: A) Multi-Screen Theater, Live Theater, and Public Assembly Use in the C-C T District Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.22; B) Fifty Eight Foot (58') Building Height for the Cineplex Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.9A. G-2; and (C) Extended Hours of Operation until 3:00 A.M. for 24 Days per Year for the Theater Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.9A.C.1(A) for Occasional Special Events and Screenings, with a condition that an analysis of late-night screening be conducted after 12 events or a year, whichever comes first." Adopted.

The Supervising Planner gave a brief presentation on the project.

Mayor Johnson opened the public portion of the hearing.

Opponents (Not in favor of the project): Jenny Curtis; Citizens for a Megaplex-Free Alameda (CMFA) (submitted comments); Valerie Ruma, CMFA (submitted comments); Ani Dimusheva, Appellant; Alice Ray, CMFA (submitted comments); Kristi Koenen, CMFA; Andy Crockett, CMFA (submitted comments); Vern Marsh, CMFA; Phyllis Greenwood, CMFA; Lew Brentano, CMFA (submitted comments); Joe Meylor, CMFA; Robert Gavrich, Appellant(submitted comments); Paula Rainey, CMFA; Kevin Fredrick, CMFA; Russell Kirk, CMFA (submitted comments); Richard McClure II, Alameda (not present); Arthur Lipow, Alameda (submitted letter); Deborah Overfield; David Kirwin, Alameda; David Miller, Alameda; Jon Spangler, Alameda; Gary McAffe, Alameda; Mark Dombeck, Alameda; Ana Rojas, Alameda; Clyde Serda, Alameda (submitted comments); Glen Vivion; Susan Battaglia, Alameda; Rosemary McNally, Alameda (submitted comments); William F. Assali, Alameda (not present); Irene Dieter, Alameda.

Proponents (In favor of the project): Rich Warner, Alameda; Gail Wetzork, Alameda; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, Alameda; Cathy Leong, Alameda; Kevin Leong, Alameda; Fritz Mayer, Alameda; Bruce Reeves, Alameda (not present); Harvey Brook, Alameda; Lars Hanson, Park Street Business Association (PSBA); Barbara Marchand, Marchand Associates; Sherri Hansell, Alameda; Mary Amen; Debbie George, Alameda; Lowell Schneider,(PSBA); Blake Brydon, Alameda; Barry Finkelstein, Alameda; Mike Corbitt, Chamber of Commerce Board; Chuck Carlise; Alameda; Marilyn Schumacher, Alameda (not present);

Robert Doumitt, Alameda (not present); Robert McKean, Alameda; Sherri Stieg, WABA; Walt Jacobs, Chamber of Commerce (not present); Kyle Conner, Applicant; Harry Hartman, Alameda (not present); Nancy Brandt, Alameda; Michael Torrey, Alameda; Frank George, Alameda; Melody Marr, Chamber of Commerce (read list of 14 people in favor of the project); Duane Watson, Lee Auto Supply.

There being no further speakers, Mayor Johnson closed the public portion of the hearing.

Councilmember Daysog stated that people can always agree to disagree but should not be disagreeable; Councilmembers he has worked with since 1996 have all had the interest of the community in mind; the community must move forward regardless of tonight's decision; he has always focused on the dollars and cents of a project; he has reservations with the proposed alternative; other cities are doing other things; El Cerrito has purchased a historic theater and is contracting with a company to run the theater; Orinda is working with a non-profit group to preserve its historic theater; he will support the Appeal because of the dollars and cents issue; 30 cents per square foot would generate \$3 million versus 60 cents per square foot generating \$6 million over the life of a twenty year project; stated he respects the other Councilmembers' opinions.

Councilmember deHaan stated seven downtown parking sights were reviewed in October 2002; the sites were narrowed down to three: the Elk's Club, Longs, and Bank of America; the report showing that Video Maniacs was one of the sites is in error; inquired when the Video Maniacs site came into play.

The Development Services Director responded that Video Maniacs was considered as a site in a parking analysis prior to October 2002; the opportunity was shifted to Long's; there was additional dialogue combining the two sites; the shift went back to the Video Maniacs site when Long's no longer wanted to work with the City.

Councilmember deHaan stated that Video Maniacs was identified as a parking structure before the cineplex review; inquired whether five screens were ever considered.

The Development Services Director responded there were a number of proposals that had a combination of multiple screens; five screens in the historic theater were never considered.

Councilmember deHaan stated that he was referring to five screens in the cineplex.

The Development Services Director stated screen size and number of seats were discussed; internal evaluations included reviewing something smaller.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether five screens were recommended.

The Development Services Director responded that staff concluded that five screens would not be viable as competition continued to increase in the area.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the viability of a five-screen theater was understood.

The Development Services Director responded different product and configurations were reviewed.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether five screens were considered and recommended by staff.

The Development Services Director responded moving forward on the matter was considered.

Councilmember deHaan stated that Page 7 of the staff report addresses parking garage availability; the bottom line notes that the parking garage and available parking would still have an extra capacity of about 335, the day after the parking structure was built; inquired whether there was a change in October 2005.

The Development Services Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan stated that Page 28 of the study notes there would be additional parking; he is concerned about using off-street parking; inquired whether off-street private parking could be used.

The Development Services Director responded that the referenced study includes the Library; the studies are not comparable; there was some accommodation for off-street parking within the calculation of the use of the Library; off-street parking has not been calculated for the parking structure, cineplex or historic theater.

Councilmember deHaan inquired why private parking was included.

The Development Services Director responded there are a number of private parking lots that are not owned by the City, such as the Bank of America lot that make up part of the mix; the parking lots become part of the available population when office workers go

home; parking supply is not just public parking.

Councilmember deHaan stated there is no entitlement to private parking.

Councilmember Daysog moved that the Regular Meeting be continued to past midnight.

Councilmember Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether private parking could be used if there was an agreement with the owners.

The Development Services Director responded that covenants are not sought from owners for parking access.

Councilmember deHaan stated that a parking structure would not be needed according to information provided in a 2000 study; the study noted that 204 spaces were available on Saturday evenings; inquired how impacts from the Masonic Temple, high school, Kaufman Auditorium and Elks Club were calculated.

The Development Services Director responded that the analysis did not assume anything other than normal activity; seasonable events overwork a parking supply and change the normal scenario; the analysis reviews typical peak times and does not focus on the unusual.

Councilmember deHaan inquired why the 70-foot parking structure was not included in the September 29, 2005 staff report.

The Development Services Director responded the report was prior to the new project.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the 70-foot parking structure was equivalent to the Alameda Theater sign and the Twin Tower spiral.

The Development Services Director responded the 70-foot parking structure was the interior of the mechanical system elevator penthouse on the parking structure only; stated the Oak Street façade of the parking structure has now dropped to 48 feet; the final ramp roof of the sixth story goes up to just below 70 feet.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there were always seven levels to which the Development Services Director responded the

sixth story roof parking was always in place.

Councilmember deHaan stated the setbacks were done well; the cost per square foot increases with higher levels; inquired whether the soil conditions have been reviewed.

The Development Services Director responded that the site has sandy soil.

The Redevelopment Manager stated that a professional geotechnical consultant prepared a soil report; the loose sand would need to be removed; compacted, new soil would have to be brought in or the grade below could be used to add some additional spaces to make up for the setback.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether exterior architectural treatment would add to the cost.

The Development Services Director responded there are some cost savings with the revised design; the goal was to have the parking garage structure cost under or at budget; removing the brick was a savings; providing long, side openings would save on ventilation.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there was a cost estimate for the parking structure.

The Development Services Director responded that there was a ballpark estimate from the Architect; the Architect feels the project was close, if not under budget; removing ventilation and sprinkling would save money.

Councilmember deHaan stated the October 2002 cost estimate for 269 spaces was \$5.4 million.

The Development Services stated the estimate was the cost per parking space without land acquisition, relocation, and all soft costs for design and engineering; hard construction costs per space was approximately \$18,000 to \$19,000.

Councilmember deHaan stated the report shows a cost of \$16,000 per space a few years ago.

The Development Services Director stated that San Jose had a 1999 cost estimate for \$15,000 per space which ended up costing \$34,000 per space by the time the structure was built four years later; costs are difficult to estimate without construction documents.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the cost estimate was \$16

million in 2002-2003.

The Development Services Director responded that \$10.5 was bonded for the parking structure and \$7.5 million was bonded for the historic theater.

Councilmember deHaan stated the November 2004 estimate was \$24.7 million and now there was an estimate of \$26.8 million.

The Development Services Director stated that the construction contingency was gone; adding a 15% construction contingency was requested for the historic theater.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether \$28 million would consume all the dollars for the project, to which the Development Services Director responded very close.

Councilmember deHaan stated that the project might have to be value engineered.

The Development Services Director responded that there is no place to value engineer the historic theater.

Councilmember Matarrese requested a recap of the Planning Board conditions regarding 3:00 am late night screenings.

The Development Services Director stated that the two primary conditions are: 1) the operator must submit an operation plan which the Police Department and the City reviews for appropriateness, and 2) the Use Permit would be reviewed by the Planning Board (after a year) to decide whether additional conditions are needed.

The Redevelopment Manager stated that the 3:00 am use is restricted to 24 times per year in the bottom four screens.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether there would only be first-run movies at the late night screenings.

The Development Services Director responded in the affirmative; stated the requirement was part of the Development Agreement.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there would be contract Police overtime when the theater is in operation past midnight, to which the Development Services Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the Police Department would be notified a week before the special event.

The Development Services Director responded the Police Department would be notified a couple of weeks before the special event.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether special showings would be in the bigger or smaller theater.

The Development Services Director responded special showings could be a combination of both; the intent is to have all the big blockbusters start in the bigger theater.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there was a caveat to review the Use Permit after a year, to which the Development Services Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired how often the Developer ran late night movies.

The Developer responded that the new Harry Potter movie was being released Thursday at midnight; Star Wars and Serenity ran at 12:01 a.m.; approximately six movies have been shown past midnight this year.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether lowering the number of late night movies would be acceptable.

Mayor Johnson stated that the Planning Board had a very thorough discussion on midnight showings; there should be flexibility.

Councilmember deHaan stated there was no Planning Board resolution regarding cueing.

The Development Services Director stated she spoke to the Police Chief regarding the matter and concluded that nobody believes cueing would occur.

The City Attorney stated that there is a section in the Resolution regarding cueing; there are five conditions on blockbuster releases and special venues.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether there would be contract overtime for cueing, to which the Development Services Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired why a Public Works and Police Department review was requested.

The Development Services Director responded the Public Works review

was requested because of street and sidewalk issues; the Police Department review was requested for insight; special requests would be discussed among all department heads.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether the zoning district allows up to 60 feet with the granting of the Use Permit.

The Development Services Director responded in the affirmative; stated the parking structure is exempt.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether only the cineplex was being discussed, to which the Development Services Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that comments at the Planning Board meeting and tonight's meeting are no different; the Planning Board took diligence in reviewing the Municipal Code for the cineplex height requirements and did a credible job in reviewing extending hours past midnight; stated he has no problem as long as the hours are monitored.

Councilmember Matarrese moved adoption of the resolution upholding the Planning Board's approval with a condition that there be a monthly analysis of late-night screenings and a review after 12 events or a year, whichever comes first.

The Development Services Director stated that there would be a master review after 12 events.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the Planning Board would review the matter, to which Councilmember Matarrese responded in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote: Ayes - Vice Mayor Gilmore, Councilmember Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 3. Noes: Councilmember Daysog - 1. Abstentions: Councilmember deHaan - 1.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

None.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

(05-526) Status of the Infrastructure Improvement Project/Plan, including scope, issues, timelines and questions.

Councilmember Daysog requested that the Council forward

infrastructure plan ideas to the staff prior to the matter being on the agenda in December; suggested community oversight be established; requested future discussions on how streets are prioritized for crack sealing treatment.

Mayor Johnson stated she would not want to have the infrastructure report delayed in order to review options; the Council should review what other cities do; she was very disappointed when the Council learned that the infrastructure spending was cut nearly 50%, which made making the reserve appear to be false; stated the reserve is not false; deferred maintenance occurred; stated there is crack sealing all over the City; a decision was made not to do crack sealing; the Council needs more information on what is prioritized and the affects of the decisions; a long catch-up game is required due to the cuts.

Councilmember Daysog requested some level of discussion about an oversight committee that would inform the Council on issues.

Mayor Johnson stated there should be a discussion on available options and goals.

Councilmember deHaan inquired when the infrastructure report would be brought to the Council, to which the City Manager responded December.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether park deterioration would be included in the report.

The City Manager responded the report includes sidewalks, streets, street tree planning, field maintenance, facility maintenance, sewers, and storm drains.

(05-527) Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that she attended the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Conference in Oakland last week; the main topic of conversation was affordable housing; there was a strong recognition that individuals are being priced out of the Bay Area market; the 20-30 year old group stated housing was a real problem; unfortunately the language at the conference was harsh on both sides and was not a good coming together to exchange ideas.

(05-528) Councilmember deHaan stated that the Chamber of Commerce had a briefing on the Ninth Avenue project in conjunction with the Port of Oakland for 3,500 to 4,000 homes; there is continual build out on the other side of the Estuary; the City is in litigation which restricts fulfilling commitments; expressing the City's concerns regarding constraints are important.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he previously requested a summary report on Oakland developments that need to be reviewed; requested a follow up to his request.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the regular meeting at 12:37 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY- -NOVEMBER 1, 2005- -6:05 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the special meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Roll Call - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

The Special Meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(05-511) Conference with Labor Negotiators - Agency Negotiators: Craig Jory and Human Resources Director; Employee Organizations: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Management and Confidential Employees Association.

(05-512) Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing litigation; Name of case: Citizens for a Megaplex-Free Alameda v. City of Alameda, et al.

(05-513) Conference with Labor Negotiators - Agency Negotiators: Marie Gilmore and Frank Matarrese; Employee: City Attorney.

Following the Closed Session, the Special Meeting was reconvened and Mayor Johnson announced that regarding the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Management and Confidential Employees Association, the Council gave instructions to labor negotiators; regarding Existing litigation, the Council was briefed by the City Attorney; regarding the City Attorney, the Council gave instruction to the negotiators.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the Special Meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY- -NOVEMBER 1, 2005- -7:25 P.M.

Mayor/Chair Johnson convened the Special Joint Meeting at 7:45 p.m.
Councilmember/Commissioner Matarrese led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers/Commissioners Daysog,
deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and Mayor/
Chair Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember/Commissioner Matarrese moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Vice Mayor/Commissioner Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

[Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*05-514CC/05-049CIC) Minutes of the Special Joint City Council and Community Improvement Commission and Special Community Improvement Commission meetings held on October 18, 2005. Approved.

(*05-515CC/05-050CIC) Recommendation to accept the Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending September 30, 2005 and approve the supplemental appropriations. Accepted.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor/Chair Johnson adjourned the Special Joint Meeting at 7:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk
Secretary, Community Improvement
Commission

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.